

REMARKS

Claims 1-8, 10-17 and 19-26 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 9, 18 and 27 were previously cancelled.

In the Office Action of May 11, 2009, claims 1-8, 10-17 and 19-26 were rejected. With this Amendment, claims 1, 10 and 19 were amended.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims

Claims 1-8, 10-17 and 19-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Angles et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 5,933,811) (“*Angles*”) in view of *Prust* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,735,623) (“*Prust*”) in further view of *Cunningham et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 7,353,267) (“*Cunningham*”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In relevant part, independent claims 1, 10 and 19 recite a content management system containing a content management portion which determines the total period for which each content was stored or linked in each user area and creates a database containing the determined values.

The Examiner correctly asserts that *Angles* fails to teach counting the period for which each content was stored or linked in each user area and creating a database containing the counted values. See Office Action of May 11, 2009, Page 4. Accordingly, *Angles* fails to teach determining a total period for which each content was stored or linked in each user area or and creating a database containing the determined values.

Nowhere do *Prust* or *Cunningham* disclose anything pertaining to determining and storing any total period, much less determining the total period for which each content was stored or linked in each user area and creating a database containing the determined value.

Prust merely discloses deleting files on a server which are not authenticated by a specific date. See, U.S. Pat. No. 6,735,623, Col. 7, l. 1-11. *Cunningham* discloses a table of ads in a database where the ads are listed in order of download from newest at the top of the list to oldest on the bottom of the list and the ads at the bottom of the list, the oldest, are deleted. See, U.S. Pat. No. 7,353,267, Col. 10, l. 58-Col. 11, l. 2.

As the Applicant's specification discloses, by providing a content management system containing a content management portion which determines the total period for which each content was stored or linked in each user area and creates a database containing the determined values, an advertiser can determine the effectiveness of their ad campaign. See, U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0073190, Para. [0060]-[0061].

Therefore, because *Angles*, *Prust*, *Cunningham* or any combination of them fails to disclose or even fairly suggest every feature of claims 1, 10 and 19, the rejection of claims 1, 10 and 19 cannot stand. Because claims 2-8, 11-17 and 20-26 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 10 and 19, they are allowable for at least the same reasons.

II. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 10, 2009

By: /David R. Metzger/
David R. Metzger
Registration No. 32,919
SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000